·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/080,613	SIEBER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Twyler M. Lamb	2622
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun. - If the period for reply specified above, is less than thirty (30) of the communical field of the comm	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a lication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir lory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, by statute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	l on <u>22 February 2002</u> .	`
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b	n)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims		
4) \boxtimes Claim(s) <u>6-24</u> is/are pending in the ap	plication.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-24</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.		
If approved, corrected drawings are requi	ired in reply to this Office action.	
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	domestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign langu 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper	0-948) 5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 04-01)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 3



Art Unit: 2622

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary Amendment

- In the preliminary amendment, Applicant cancels claim 1. In the remarks section,
 Applicant references that claims 1-5 are canceled. Correction to the preliminary
 amendment is required.
- 2. Examiner considered application with claims 6-24 as though claims 1-5 were canceled correctly.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).



Art Unit: 2622

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 6-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,651. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. In claim 6 of the current, the applicant uses the phraseology "a method of bleed-printing, comprising acts of: inserting a product to be printed into a printer, the product being attached to a carrier that is larger, in at least one dimension, than the product; bleed-printing on the product so that the printed matter extends beyond at least one edge of the product; and removing the product from the carrier" which can be interpreted to be a broader statement of "a method of bleed-printing," comprising the steps of: attaching a product to a carrier, at least one dimension of the carrier being larger than at least one dimension of the product; bleed-printing matter on the product and on the carrier so that the printed matter extends from the product onto the carrier; and removing the product from the carrier" which can be interpreted to be a broader statement" as stated in claim 15 in the previously issued patent {U.S. 6,106,651}.

In claim 7 of the current, the applicant uses the phraseology "wherein, the product is attached to the carrier by an adhesive, and wherein after the act of removing, the product is substantially free of tacky residue from the adhesive" which can be interpreted to be a broader statement of "wherein, in said attaching step, said product is

Application/Control Number: 10/080,613

Art Unit: 2622

attached to said carrier in such a way that, after the removing step, the product is substantially free of tacky residue" which can be interpreted to be a broader statement" as stated in claim 16 in the previously issued patent {U.S. 6,106,651}. These are only a few noted points of obviousness.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during the prosecution of the application which matured into a patent.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Twyler Lamb whose telephone number is 703 - 308-8823. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 703-308-4712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

(for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Application/Control Number: 10/080,613

Art Unit: 2622

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two

2121 Crystal Drive

Arlington. VA.

Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Twyler Lamb

September 29, 2003